

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the current application. Claims 1 and 11 are independent claims.

35 U.S.C 102(b) Premierlani

Claims 1-4, 7 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Premierlani. Applicant respectfully traverses this art grounds of rejection.

Premierlani deals exclusively with round trip delay (RTD). Premierlani does not disclose or suggest a time offset. The Examiner alleges that “round trip delay is interpreted as a time offset between the central and secondary nodes” (see page 3 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s characterization of a time offset as an RTD.

RTD relates to the transmission delay of a first message sent from a first node to a second node and a second message sent from the second node back to the first node. The processing time (i.e., the time in which the second message is being prepared at the second node) is subtracted from the RTD calculation. Therefore the RTD is the time a message is in transit between the nodes. RTD is not directed to a clock synchronization between the first node and the second node, but rather merely provides a transmission delay between the first node and the second node. Premierlani states “time stamp values can be obtained using software or hardware, provided that any jitter is limited to less than plus or minus about 130 microseconds” (column 6, lines 37-39). The “jitter” disclosed by Premierlani is a threshold value pertaining to the difference between clocks at the first and the second nodes. This difference between the clocks of the first and the second node is the time offset (i.e., a difference in clock synchronizations). Premierlani merely states that the calculation of the RTD is invalidated when the “jitter” or time offset is above a given amount.

Therefore, Premierlani does not disclose or suggest “determining a time offset” as disclosed in independent claims 1 and 11.

As such, claims 2-4 and 7, dependent upon independent claim 1, are likewise allowable over Premierlani at least for the reasons given above with respect to independent claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this art grounds of rejection.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Premierlani in view of Thornberg

Claims 5-6 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Premierlani in view of Thornberg. Applicant respectfully traverses this art grounds of rejection.

The Examiner alleges that “Thornberg teaches calculating a plurality of uplink and downlink delays in order to find a average uplink and downlink delay” (see page 4 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully submits that even if Thornberg were to teach this, Thornberg fails to disclose or suggest the deficiencies of Premierlani as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

As such, claims 5-6 and 8-10, dependent upon independent claim 1, are likewise allowable over Premierlani and Thornberg at least for the reasons given above with respect to independent claim 1.

Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this art grounds of rejection.

Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (703)668-8000.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
703) 668-8000

GDY/DAP/krf